



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,428	10/31/2000	Blaine D. Gaither	10001666-1	2979
22879	7590	08/10/2004	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			THOMPSON, MARC D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/703,428

Applicant(s)

GAITHER ET AL.

Examiner

Marc D. Thompson

Art Unit

2144

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-36.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

MARC D. THOMPSON  
MARC THOMPSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5.:

The request for reconsideration does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner disagrees with the Applicant assertion that the claims necessarily require a store-and-forward type arrangement as argued. The breadth of the claims recite the transfer and subsequent storage of a packet received from a source node within a fault tolerant storage system, where the packet is stored, and then transferred to a destination node, thereby effecting a transfer of packet(s) from the source node to destination node(s) through an intermediate, reliable, fault tolerant, storage subsystem. The teachings of Utter provide, minimally, the storage and retrieval of data for processing at various types of processing end points. See, inter alia, Column 3, Lines 17-67. The provision for storage of information (one or more packets) from source device(s), stored within the storage subsystem, and the reception of this data from the storage subsystem at a destination device(s), was disclosed. That is, the use of a terminal to store information in the fault tolerant storage system, the storage, and then subsequent retrieval of that information from a(nother) terminal in the system, meets the claimed invention. Thus, the invention as claimed in the currently overly broad independent claims, as presented, are met by the combination of the teachings of Utter and Byers. Applicant seems to argue that the art fails to teach basic store-and-forward type transfer of information. Minimally, since the processing units disclosed by Utter take input information for storage from the terminal(s), store the information, then retrieve the information at other/same terminal(s), this simplistic overview does not make sense. Likewise, discussion concerning various protocols/network types (e.g., ethernet, etc.), is irrelevant to the claimed invention, since no details of this type are present in the claimed invention. In short, given the current breadth of the claimed invention, Applicant attempts to present arguments which does not necessarily relate to the invention as claimed. It is noted that Applicant has failed to modify the claim language to distinguish over the prior art of record by clarifying or substantially narrowing the claim language. Thus, Applicant apparently intends that a broad interpretation be given to the claims and the Examiner has adopted such in the present and previous Office action rejections. See *In re Prater and Wei*, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969), and MPEP § 2111. Applicant employs broad language which includes the use of words and phrases which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intend broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response, and reiterates the need for the Applicant to clearly, distinctly, and uniquely claim the invention. The current claims infer coverage breadth which is inconsistent with breadth of the disclosure and are not found distinguishable above the prior art of record.

MARC D. THOMPSON

MDT

PRIMARY EXAMINER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY